

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vigania 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

09/423,436 11/09/1999 HIROSHI KANAYAMA 991238 6727 23850 7590 09/11/2003 ARMSTRONG,WESTERMAN & HATTORI, LLP 1725 K STREET, NW SUITE 1000 EXAMINER LAVILLA, MICHAEL E	23850 7590 09/11/2003 ARMSTRONG, WESTERMAN & HATTORI, LLP 1725 K STREET, NW SUITE 1000 LAVILLA, MICHAEL E WASHINGTON, DC 20006	23850 7590 09/11/2003 ARMSTRONG,WESTERMAN & HATTORI, LLP 1725 K STREET, NW SUITE 1000 WASHINGTON, DC 20006 ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	APPLICATION NO.	F	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
ARMSTRONG, WESTERMAN & HATTORI, LLP 1725 K STREET, NW EXAMINER	ARMSTRONG, WESTERMAN & HATTORI, LLP 1725 K STREET, NW SUITE 1000 LAVILLA, MICHAEL E WASHINGTON, DC 20006	ARMSTRONG, WESTERMAN & HATTORI, LLP 1725 K STREET, NW SUITE 1000 WASHINGTON, DC 20006 EXAMINER LAVILLA, MICHAEL E ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	09/423,436		11/09/1999	HIROSHI KANAYAMA	991238	6727
1725 K STREET, NW	1725 K STREET, NW SUITE 1000 LAVILLA, MICHAEL E WASHINGTON, DC 20006	1725 K STREET, NW SUITE 1000 WASHINGTON, DC 20006 LAVILLA, MICHAEL E ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	23850	7590	09/11/2003			
,	SUITE 1000 LAVILLA, MICHAEL E WASHINGTON, DC 20006	SUITE 1000 WASHINGTON, DC 20006 LAVILLA, MICHAEL E ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER					EXAMINER	
		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		,	<i>'</i>	LAVILLA, MICHAEL E		
1775	1775						DATE MAILED: 09/11/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/423,436	KANAYAMA ET AL.
,	Examin r	Art Unit
	Michael La Villa	1775
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the co	orrespondence address
THE REPLY FILED 06 August 2003 FAILS TO PLACE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applice that application is a simply filed amendment which	cation. A proper reply to a
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advievent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dat have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three mo earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE e on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in the statutory period for reply set in the statutory period for reply set in the statutory period for the statutory period for the statutory period for the statutory period for the	the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 36(a) and the appropriate extension fee fee. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in
1 A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR	s Brief must be filed within the p R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal o	eriod set forth in of the appeal.
$2 \boxtimes$ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:	
(a) 🛛 they raise new issues that would require furthe	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) 🛛 they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application i issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	erially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ng a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claims.
NOTE:		
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a so	eparate, timely filed amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: Sec	reconsideration has been cons <u>e Attachment</u> .	idered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bed raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendments explanation of how the new or amended claims we	(s) a)⊠ will not be entered or b) ould be rejected is provided belo	☐ will be entered and an w or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed: NONE		
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected: 1,2,4-7, and 9-12.		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapp	roved by the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen		
10. ☐ Other:	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	

Application/Control Number: 09/423,436 Page 2

Art Unit: 1775

ADVISORY ACTION

 The request for reconsideration has been considered and does not place the application in condition for allowance.

- 2. Applicant contends that the negative limitation previously rejected does not constitute new matter because the embodiment disclosed in the Specification can be described by the proposed negative limitation structure. However, there is no disclosure of the embodiment in negative limitation terms. Rather, the pointed to portions appear to teach one layer directly disposed on another, in contrast to the proposed negative limitation manner of envisaging the invention.
- 3. Applicant's proposed amendment to clarify the composition of copper alloy in Claim 2 does not clarify the composition. In view of the phrase "copper alloy containing," it is unclear whether the sliding bearing consists essentially of copper alloy or consists essentially of the specifically described copper alloy.
- 4. It is questioned whether an article such as the word "a" should precede applicant's various "solid solution" phrases.
- 5. Regarding Claims 1 and 2, it is unclear where there is literal antecedent support for the phrase "in at least the area of said second layer directly adjacent said roughened surface," which would necessitate an objection to the Specification if not present. Applicant's Response does not appear to provide a reference of antecedent support. Moreover, with respect to the already presented negative limitation rejection, this limitation would appear to be related and also comprise new matter.

Art Unit: 1775

6. The amendment has not been entered.

CONCLUSION

- 7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael La Villa whose telephone number is (703) 308-4428. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.
- 8. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Deborah Jones can be reached on (703) 308-3822. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.
- Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

Mill

Michael La Villa September 8, 2003